

Ravenna Creek Daylighting
Questions & Comments from Public Workshop #4
8/20/2002

- Will all options go into the new pipe?
- Keep soccer & baseball fields
- Keep upper field open & green
- Allow multi-use fields
- U11 soccer field type will fit most needs
- Noise issue for ballfield on upper site
- Why create new plans - The 4 plans cover all options
- Where will ballfield parking go in Alternatives 3 & 4
- Keep commons area open
- Adults using field will create a safety issue
- Rotate ox-bow in Alternative 2 to create more room in ballfield
- How will scheduled camp use be affected on upper field?
- How can input be provided if Sept. 5 cannot be attended?
- Raise field 4 to 6 feet in Alternative 1
- Adults use field. Do not post for 12 & under.
- Why not rotate/ revise field in Alternative 2?
- Will balls hit people walking?
- What happens to play equipment?
- How deep is water in ponds & stream?
- How wide is channel in Alternative 2?
- How many trees would be lost in Alternatives 3 & 4, what size?
- What are down sides to options 3 & 4
- Will climbing tree be eliminated?
- Is this an Olmstead park?
- Will this go to Landmark or Design Commission?
- Safety issues, is a fence needed?
- How do we come to a decision? What is the process?
- This group is a small percentage of the community.
- What is KC savings? What will KC fund?
- Make grand entry to improvements.
- Terrace hillside in lieu of retaining walls.
- Keep play area by climbing tree.
- Keep the park less organized; not all flat areas need to be ballfields.
- Why aren't schools being used for baseball?
- Why not move ballfield to NW corner of lower field?
- Keep grass infield on upper field.
- Reduce creek width

- Pursue grants for playground improvements.
 - Alternative 1 with more effort given to stream
 - Alternative 4 is best for stream.
 - "Magic" of upper field would be lost if upper field is used for baseball.
 - All 4 options limit current uses of property.
 - All uses need to compromise; Alternative 1 or 2 provides this.
 - Alternative 1 or 2 provides best compromise; keeps upper field as a community yard.
 - Keep it simple, go with 1 or 2
 - Project was intended to daylight creek; this should be the focus
 - Prefer Alternative 3; was one selected at last workshop
 - Enlarge pond in Alternative 1
 - Road noise on 55th will hinder pond use near 55th entry
 - Most people in area have no yards; keep upper open space.
 - Residence since 1932; Ravenna Park is privilege; All options work.
 - Like Alternative 4 with no ballfield.
 - Resident by wading pool, Alternative 3 with no ballfield.
- Keep trees, Alternative 1 is best.